

**REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS (RFP)
RATING INSTRUMENT – INSTRUCTIONS**

I. **Conflict of Interest/Confidentiality Agreement:**

Materials/documents related to the rating/evaluation of the proposals must remain confidential. Materials/documents will be protected against disclosure to any and all persons except for those authorized by Workforce Development, Aging, and Community Services (WDACS) participating in the evaluation of the proposals. The documents have not been approved for public release. Materials will not be reproduced or distributed. Materials, when unattended, must be stored in a facility commensurate with its sensitivity, and all materials distributed, as well as any and all work papers, shall be returned to the assigned Contract Analyst upon completion of the evaluation.

II. **Evaluation Committee Member (Rater) Responsibilities:**

- Members are expected to thoroughly read each proposal, compare it to the RFP requirements, and complete the rating instrument.
- Evaluation Committee Members are admonished not to discuss any aspect of the proposals or the evaluation process, with any individual, including other members of the Evaluation Committee, outside of the Evaluation Committee meetings.
- Evaluation Committee Members must be consistent in their evaluations and rely only on what is written in the proposal. Any prior experience or personnel knowledge a member may have regarding the Proposer shall be kept out of the evaluation process.
- **Members must include comments as well as notations of the proposal's narrative and documents to facilitate the scoring discussion.**
- If for any reason the rater has a working or personal relationship with one (1) or more of the Proposer's they are assigned to evaluate, the rater must immediately inform my staff, Jenifer De La Torre, in order to maintain the integrity of the evaluation process.

III. **Contract Analyst's Responsibilities:**

- The Contract Analyst will act as the Evaluation Committee Chairperson and facilitate (as a non-voting member) all Evaluation Committee meetings and ensure compliance with County contracting processes.
- Contract staff/subject matter experts will analyze and score the cost proposals and present the scores to the Evaluation Committee for inclusion in the final score.
- The Contract Analyst will provide all other relevant information to the committee during the meetings for final scoring.

IV. **Evaluation Packet:**

- Rating Instrument/Instructions
- Request for Proposals
- Rater Roster

V. **RFP Rating Timeline:**

RFP orientation January 9, 2017
Evaluation period January 9, 2017 – January 27, 2017
Evaluation Documents Due January 30, 2017
Informed Averaging meetings start week of January 30, 2017

**REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS (RFP)
RATING INSTRUMENT – INSTRUCTIONS**

VI. Instructions – Submission of Rating Instrument:

After you've completed the rating, submit your completed rating instrument to Jenifer De La Torre located at 3175 West 6th Street, Los Angeles, CA 90020, Room 403 or via email at ajccrfp@css.lacounty.gov.

VII. Instructions for Raters Using Excel:

The rating instrument is composed of seven main worksheets:

1. Mandatory Minimum Qualifications – MMQ
2. Submission Requirements – Sub
3. Los Angeles County Rated – LACO Rated
4. Business Proposal (Including subparts Youth, Vets, Rapid Response, and SCSEP)
5. Budget Proposal - BudgetProp
6. MMQ and Submission Summary - MMQ & Sub
7. Scoring Summary – Summary

The **Rating Instrument** is the evaluation tool the rater will use to rate the proposal(s) assigned. The **Summary** is a summary of total points given by the rater. The rater can access each worksheet by locating the “tabs” in the lower left hand corner of the workbook. Click on the individual tab to access the worksheet.

The **Business, its applicable subparts, and Cost Proposals are the only pages the rater will be required to enter information.** The MMQ, Sub, and LACO Rated tabs will be completed by WDACS. The Summaries are also for WDACS' use only and the rater will not be required to enter information into these worksheets; this sheet will self-populate based on the information entered into the Rating Instrument by the Rater. **Raters will sign the final Rating Instrument after the Informed Averaging meeting.**

VIII. General Rater Instructions:

Please enter your name, rater number (from the Raters Roster), team number, and name of the Proposer. If you are using the Excel workbook, the rater will only have to enter their information once (the rater must enter the information on the first page (MMQ) of the rating instrument in order for the “heading” to repeat on every page). If you are using a printed copy of the rating instrument the rater will need to manually enter the information mentioned above on every page.

Each section of the rating instrument corresponds to a section of the RFP. Each section will be identified by the RFP Section, RFP Question, Comments and possible points for each section. Below is a further explanation of each section in the rating instrument.

RFP Section: Each section of the RFP the Proposer was to respond to is referred to by the RFP Section number.

RFP Question: Either the entire RFP question or a condensed version of the RFP section is inserted here.

Points Possible: Each section of the RFP has a list of possible scores the Rater may give to a particular RFP section. There will be a set of ranges labeled as 1) Exceeds, 2) Meets, 3) Weak, and 4) Not Met. **The labels (Exceed, Meets, Weak and Not Met) are**

**REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS (RFP)
RATING INSTRUMENT – INSTRUCTIONS**

indicators used to assist the rater in determining the points assigned to each section, however, the rater shall provide a numeric score to each RFP section unless otherwise requested.

“X”: for subparts with an “X” in the heading, please provide a point breakdown based on the response provided by the Proposer. The aggregated total cannot exceed the total points given for a particular rating. For example, if the Proposer's response is rated as "Met", and the total points given to the rating “Met” is 2,450, the total point distribution shall equal 2,450 points.

Exceeds: This rating should be given when the proposal clearly presents enough information that indicates a higher level than what is required in the RFP. For example, if the factor being evaluated is the requirement of three years’ experience and the proposal clearly indicates that the firm has ten years of experience and has provided dates to validate that claim, then they have exceeded this requirement of the RFP.

Meets: This rating should be given when the proposal presents enough information to ascertain compliance with the requirement of the RFP factor being rated - no more and no less. Using the previous example, if the proposal only includes dates verifying that the firm has three years of experience (and no more), then a rating of "Meets" would be appropriate.

Weak: This rating should be given if there is questionable compliance, or if the discussion of the RFP requirement is brief or merely an affirmation that the proposer will comply with the RFP requirement being rated. Using the previous example, if the firm said they had three years’ experience, but did not support it with appropriate dates or client references, then a rating of “weak” is appropriate.

Not Met: This rating should be given in two situations: 1) the proposal does not address or acknowledge a certain RFP factor, or 2) the proposal indicates an inappropriate or different response to what is being asked for in the RFP. Using the previous example, a "not met" rating would be appropriate if the firm did not include anything about its experience.

Comments: This section is provided for each question to allow the rater to further explain the reason behind a particular score. **The Rater must provide comments for each section to fully justify the score.**

Questions: Any questions concerning the instructions or scoring of this RFP can be directed to Jenifer De La Torre @ (323) 807-8616 or by email: jvaldez@css.lacounty.gov